

BEFORE THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

RECEIVED

2003 OCT 16 PM 3:52

October 16, 2003

T.R.A. DOCKET ROOM

IN RE:)
Implementation of the Federal Communications) Docket No.: 03-00491
Commission's Triennial Review Order (Nine)
Month Proceeding))

RESPONSE OF COMPSOUTH TO PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE

Competitive Carriers of the Southeast, Inc. ("CompSouth")¹ has reviewed the procedural schedule proposed by the Hearing Officer, Director Ron Jones, in the above-captioned proceeding.

CompSouth appreciates that the dates proposed for the hearing are consistent with the hearing dates jointly proposed by CompSouth and BellSouth in their September 10, 2003 letter to the Authority. Because of the necessity of coordinating hearings in nine states, any change in the schedule by one state could impact scheduling efforts in other states.

Under the Hearing Officer's schedule, direct testimony will be due in Tennessee on Friday, January 16, 2004 and rebuttal on Friday, February 27. CompSouth would like to draw the Hearing Officer's attention to the parties' proposed schedule (attached) for "State 5," the state immediately following Tennessee. Direct testimony in State 5 is due on Monday, January 19, and rebuttal on Monday, March 1.

Thus, the parties will be making substantial filings of direct and rebuttal testimony in Tennessee on a Friday followed by equally substantial filings in State 5 on the following

¹ CompSouth members include: ITC DeltaCom; MCI, Business Telecom Inc., NewSouth Communications Corp., AT&T; Nuvox Communications Inc.; Access Integrated Networks, Inc.; Birch Telecom; Talk America; Cnergy Communications Company; Z-Tel Communications; Network Telephone Corp.; Momentum Business Solutions; Covad; KMC Telecom; IDS Telcom and Xspedius Corp.

Monday. CompSouth suggests that this will place a substantial burden on those individuals who will be working on filings in both states and therefore asks that the Hearing Officer consider moving the dates for filing direct and rebuttal testimony back to Monday, January 12 and Monday, February 23. This small adjustment should not inconvenience the agency but would be of great help to the parties.

CompSouth also believes that a second round of discovery may be needed by one or more parties and asks that the Hearing Officer explicitly recognize that any party may request such additional discovery. Issues relating to objections to additional discovery questions can be addressed as they arise.

CompSouth otherwise supports the proposed schedule and will be available at the pre-hearing conference on October 21 to discuss these issues.

Respectfully submitted,

BOULT, CUMMINGS, CONNERS & BERRY, PLC

By: 

Henry Walker
414 Union Street, Suite 1600
P.O. Box 198062
Nashville, Tennessee 37219
(615) 252-2363

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on October 16 2003, a copy of the foregoing document was serviced on the parties of record, via US mail:

Guy Hicks
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
333 Commerce St., Suite 2101
Nashville, TN 37201

Charles B. Welch, Esquire
Farris, Mathews, et. Al
618 Church St., #300
Nashville, TN 37219

Timothy Phillips, Esquire
Office of Tennessee Attorney General
P. O. Box 20207
Nashville, Tennessee 37202

H. LaDon Baltimore, Esquire
Farrar & Bates
211 Seventh Ave., N. #320
Nashville, TN 37219-1823

James Wright, Esquire
United Telephone – Southeast
14111 Capital Blvd.
Wake Forest, NC 27587

Martha M. Ross-Bain, Esq.
AT&T Communications of the
South Central States, LLC
1200 Peachtree Street, Suite 8100
Atlanta, GA 30309


Ms. Carol Kuhnow
Qwest Communications, Inc.
4250 N. Fairfax Dr.
Arlington, VA 33303

Jon E. Hastings, Esq.
Boult, Cummings, et al.
P. O. Box 198062
Nashville, TN 37219-8062

Dale Grimes, Esq.
Bass, Berry & Sims
315 Deaderick St., #2700
Nashville, TN 37238-3001

Mark W. Smith, Esq.
Strang, Fletcher, et al.
One Union Square, #400
Chattanooga, TN 37402

Nanette S. Edwards, Esq.
ITC^DeltaCom
4092 South Memorial Parkway
Huntsville, AL 35802


Henry Walker

RECEIVED

September 10, 2003

Hon. Deborah Taylor Tate, Chairman
Tennessee Regulatory Authority
460 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37238

Hon. Pat Miller, Director
Tennessee Regulatory Authority
460 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37238

Hon. Ron Jones, Director
Tennessee Regulatory Authority
460 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37238

Hon. Sara Kyle, Director
Tennessee Regulatory Authority
460 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37238

Re: *Implementation of the Federal Communications Commission's Triennial Review
Order (Nine Month Proceeding)*
Docket No. 03-00491

Dear Chairman Tate, Director Jones, Director Miller and Director Kyle:

The purpose of this letter is to supplement the presentation made by representatives of BellSouth and CompSouth¹ during the SEARUC breakfast in Denver. At that time, BellSouth and CompSouth reported that we were in discussions in an attempt to arrive at a region-wide proposal for the scheduling and conduct of the state proceedings that have been required by the FCC's recent Triennial Review Order ("TRO"). As you know, the FCC's TRO requires the states to conduct and conclude certain proceedings within the next nine months. Because every state will have to engage in this process simultaneously, there has been considerable concern about avoiding scheduling and other potential conflicts among the various state proceedings in the BellSouth region, since these cases will often involve the same parties, issues, and witnesses.

We are pleased to report that BellSouth and CompSouth have developed a proposal that we believe will allow these state proceedings to occur in a manner that will avoid the inevitable conflicts that would occur if every state proceeded independently. The attached spreadsheet lays out our proposal in the form of a schedule that sets out dates for the filing of testimony, holding hearings, the filing of post-hearing briefs, and the presentation of oral arguments. If this proposal is adopted by all of the states in the BellSouth region, we should be able to avoid any major conflicts in scheduling among the states.

You will note that the schedule does not identify the order in which the states would proceed. While we do not intend to be presumptuous, and we understand fully that each state establishes its own calendar, based on what we understood the sentiments to be in Denver, we suggest that Florida and Georgia should be the first two states, followed by North Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, South Carolina, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Kentucky. We understood that

¹ CompSouth members include: ITC DeltaCom; MCI; Business Telecom Inc.; NewSouth Communications Corp.; AT&T; Nuvox Communications Inc.; Access Integrated Networks, Inc.; Birch Telecom; Talk America; Cinergy Communications Company; Z-Tel Communications; Network Telephone Corp.; Momentum Business Solutions; Covad; KMC Telecom; IDS Telcom and Xspedius Corp.

Hon. Deborah Taylor Tate, Chairman
Hon. Ron Jones, Director
Hon. Pat Miller, Director
Hon. Sara Kyle, Director
September 10, 2003
Page 2 of 4

the order of the first three states and the last two were discussed in Denver. We arranged the middle four states in a manner that would minimize travel between the states, as we have proposed hearings to run week after week, with no real break for the participants.

As you will note, our proposal envisions lengthier hearings in the initial states and stages of these proceedings based on our experience that has shown that multistate hearings generally take longer during the first hearings than during later hearings. This is because in multi-state proceedings, the parties often find that they can enter into agreements to stipulate testimony and records in the latter states and stages of the proceedings, which tends to shorten the needed hearing dates and time necessary to conduct the proceedings. As the hearings in the latter states and stages become more truncated as a result of these stipulations, however, the need for the parties to be able to present oral argument to summarize the stipulated record increases in importance.

We also propose that these state proceedings be conducted either in two separate dockets, or one docket with two sub-dockets in each state for the reasons described below.

Essentially these state proceedings, which are required to be conducted in nine months, are going to be concerned with discharging the Authority's responsibilities in implementing the unbundling requirements of Rule 51.319 in determining principally (1) the continued availability of unbundled local switching for the mass market (the "UNE-P case"), and (2) the continued availability of unbundled high capacity transport on certain routes and unbundled high capacity loops at certain locations (the High Capacity Loop Transport case). The FCC has provided an analytical framework and specific triggers for each of these determinations and cases. We have determined that some CLECs have an interest in the UNE-P portion of the case but not the High Capacity Loop Transport portion of the case, and vice versa. Given this, together with the fact that the data to be analyzed in the two situations are completely separate, there will be a need to create a different record for each portion of the case.

Furthermore, it appears that the issues raised by the High Capacity Loop Transport portion of the case will be much more fact specific, dealing with individual route- and location specific facilities. Given that the Authority must conduct and complete these proceedings in nine months, our schedule proposes that the hearings be bifurcated for each specific case/subject matter, with the High Capacity Loop Transport portion of the case to follow immediately after the conclusion of the UNE-P portion of the case. In addition, given the different nature of the UNE-P and High Capacity Loop Transport portions of the case, the schedule proposes that there will be three rounds of testimony (Direct, Rebuttal and Surrebuttal) for the UNE-P portion of the case, and two rounds of testimony (Direct and Rebuttal) for the High Capacity Loop and Transport portion of the case. As you will see from the attached schedule, the Direct testimony in the High Capacity Loop Transport portion of the case is to be filed at the same time as the Rebuttal testimony in the UNE-P portion of the case, and the Rebuttal testimony in the High

Hon. Deborah Taylor Tate, Chairman
Hon. Ron Jones, Director
Hon. Pat Miller, Director
Hon. Sara Kyle, Director
September 10, 2003
Page 3 of 4

Capacity Loop Transport portion of the case is to be filed at the same time as the Surrebuttal testimony in the UNE-P portion of the case.

We have also proposed that Week 32 (the week of May 10, 2004) be reserved across the region for "overflow" hearings. We anticipate that these "overflow" hearings could be necessitated by (1) the need to conclude the High Capacity Loop Transport portion of the case in any particular state or (2) the presentation of evidence concerning the potential deployment of certain high capacity loops and transport where the wholesale and self-provider triggers are not satisfied. (See Rules 51.319 (a)(5)(ii); 51.319 (a)(6)(ii); 51.319 (e)(2)(ii); and 51.319 (e)(3)(ii)). Until the completion of discovery, BellSouth cannot determine whether it will elect to present evidence concerning the "potential deployment" of certain high capacity loops and transport pursuant to these rules, but if it does, the parties anticipate that the time afforded by the period set aside for the "overflow" hearings may be necessary. The parties hope that the time scheduled for hearings in each state will accommodate all of these needs in the first instance, but should that not be the case, BellSouth and CompSouth believe it would be prudent to set aside time now for these "overflow" hearings. BellSouth has committed to notify the parties as soon as it makes a determination about how it intends to proceed in the High Capacity Loop Transport portion of the case with regard to presenting evidence on the potential, as opposed to actual, deployment of facilities under the FCC's rules. BellSouth anticipates making that decision very soon after the completion of discovery in these proceedings.

We also reiterate to the Authority that neither BellSouth nor CompSouth, on behalf of its members, intends to request that the Authority conduct a 90-day case regarding access to unbundled local switching for DS1 and above loops. (See Rule 51.319 (d)(3)(i)). However, if another party requests that the Authority conduct such a review, BellSouth and CompSouth, on behalf of its members, reserve the right to participate in such a proceeding.

In addition to the attached proposed schedule for the 9 months following the October 2nd effective date of the TRO, we are also working on, and have substantially completed, an agreement that deals with how region-wide discovery will be conducted; how the parties to these proceedings will serve each other with discovery, testimony, and other pleadings; and how region-wide confidentiality agreements will be handled. Because of the number of parties expected to participate and the short time in which these proceedings will have to conclude, we anticipate agreeing upon shortened discovery periods and electronic, rather than paper, service of everything we file in these proceedings, at least to the extent possible. If the schedule we propose is acceptable to the Authority, we will follow up with our proposal regarding these matters in short order.


In conclusion, let us reiterate that in making this proposal, we do not intend to compromise this Authority's authority in these matters. Rather, we are merely offering a proposal that we believe will facilitate the conduct and resolution of the proceedings that the


Hon. Deborah Taylor Tate, Chairman
Hon. Ron Jones, Director
Hon. Pat Miller, Director
Hon. Sara Kyle, Director
September 10, 2003
Page 4 of 4

FCC's TRO has delegated to the 9 state Commissions in the BellSouth region. We recognize that this proposed schedule leaves some matters open, such as pre-hearing and issue identification conferences if they are required. However, we believe that the proposed schedule captures all of the major activities that will be required.

We are available to discuss this proposal either individually with each state Commission or collectively with the SEARUC Commissions.

Sincerely,


CompSouth
Jerry Watts, President
By RDL w/EP


BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
R. Douglas Lackey
Sr. Corporate Counsel-Regulatory

Attachment

cc: Richard Collier, General Counsel
Joe Werner, Chief, Telecommunications

wk beginning	week	State 1	State 2	State 3	State 4	State 5	State 6	State 7	State 8	State 9
6-Oct	1									
13-Oct	2									
20-Oct	3									
27-Oct	4									
3-Nov	5									
10-Nov	6									
17-Nov	7									
24-Nov	8									
1-Dec	9									
8-Dec	10									
15-Dec	11	Direct (F)	Direct (Tu)							
22-Dec	12									
29-Dec	13									
5-Jan	14									
12-Jan	15			Direct (Th)						
19-Jan	16	Reb/Dir (F)			Direct (F)					
26-Jan	17		Reb/Dir (F)			Direct (Tu)	Direct (Th)			
2-Feb	18							Direct (F)		
9-Feb	19	Surreb/Reb (F)							Direct (W)	Direct (Tu)
16-Feb	20		Surreb/Reb (W)	Reb/Dir (F)						
23-Feb	21	Hearings (M-F)								
1-Mar	22	Hearings (M-W)								
8-Mar	23		Hearings (M-F)	Surreb/Reb (W)						
15-Mar	24		Hearings (M-W)							
22-Mar	25			Hearings (M-F)						
29-Mar	26	Direct brief (Tu)								
5-Apr	27		Direct brief (Tu)							
12-Apr	28	Reb/Dir (F)								
19-Apr	29		Reb/Dir (F)							
26-Apr	30									
3-May	31									
10-May	32	Reserve for Overflow hearings	Reserve for Overflow hearings	Reserve for Overflow hearings						
17-May	33	Oral Arguments (M)	Oral Arguments (Tu)	Oral Arguments (W)						
24-May	34									
31-May	35									
7-Jun	36									
14-Jun	37									
21-Jun	38									
28-Jun	39	Decision	Decision	Decision	Decision	Decision	Decision	Decision	Decision	Decision
Notes										
Yellow shading indicates Holiday weeks										
First round of testimony presents direct case on switching impairment										
Second round of testimony presents rebuttal case on switching impairment and separate testimony for direct case on hi-cap loop and transport impairment										
Third round of testimony presents surrebuttal case on switching impairment and separate testimony for rebuttal case on hi-cap loop and transport impairment										